

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

With this amendment, claims 27 and 29 are cancelled, claims 23, 28, 30 and 32 are amended and new claims 35 and 36 are added. The Applicants submit that the amendments are supported by, for example, Figures 27-29 and paragraphs 63-70 of the application as filed, and that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-19, 33 and 34 have been withdrawn. Claims 20, 22, 27 and 29 have been cancelled. Claims 21, 23-26, 28 30-32, 35 and 36 are pending.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to for not showing every feature of claim 29. Claim 29 has been cancelled and so this objection is now moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 USC 112 but has been cancelled. This rejection is now moot.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claim 21 was rejected as being anticipated by Foulds. Claim 21 includes, among other things, a second generally horizontal cord generally parallel to and above a first generally horizontal cord and a plurality of struts between the first and second cords. The Applicants submit that there are no such elements in Foulds and so claim 21 is not anticipated by Foulds.

Claims 23 and 31 were rejected as being anticipated by Beltz. Claim 23 as amended recites, among other things, pairs of cords, slidable along each other. The cords have webs and flanges. The webs of the cords in a pair are separated from each other by the flanges of a cord. Beltz does not have any of these elements and so does not anticipate claim 23. Claim 31 depends on claim 23. Claim 31 also recites lines of holes spaced by

a selected increment extending from near the end of a truss section to beyond a first one of the struts. Beltz also does not have this element. Accordingly, claim 31 is not anticipated by Beltz.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 103

Claims 24, 28, 30 and 32 were rejected as being obvious over Beltz. The rejection implicitly relies on Beltz as applied to the anticipation rejection of claim 23. For the reasons above, the Applicants submit that claim 23 is not anticipated by Beltz and so the obviousness rejections do not establish a *prima facie* case. Further, in relation to claim 28, the Applicants submit that Beltz only teaches joining truss sections as shown in Figure 7 of Beltz which does not involve engaging surfaces or pairs of cords slideable along each other. The matter of claim 30 is not taught in Beltz and, further, is inconsistent with the struts in Beltz being able to be folded into the cords. The matter of claim 32 is not taught or suggested in any way in Beltz and is not merely the creation of a multi-piece assembly.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected as being patentable over Beltz in view of Botel. The rejection implicitly applies Beltz to claim 23 as in the anticipation rejection of claim 23. For the reasons given above, the Applicants submit that claim 23 is not anticipated, and so there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness. Further, the Office Action has not provided any evidence as to any teaching, motivation or suggestion to combine Beltz and Botel so as to produce the claimed invention. Both Botel and Beltz describe methods of making a truss with upper and lower cords. They provide alternative teachings without any suggestion towards claims 25 or 26.

The Applicants submit that new claims 35 and 36 recite further elements not anticipated or made obvious by any of the cited references.

Appl. No. 10/660,528
Amdt. Dated July 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 7, 2006

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that the claims are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

JACKSON et al.

By Scott Pundsack
Scott Pundsack
Reg. No. 47,330